REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application and have been rejected by the Examiner as follows. Claims 1 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0139208 A1 (Tuli).

Tuli discloses a system that allows multiple users operating a personal digital assistant (PDA) receiving information from a server via a cellular phone to access the Internet or World Wide Web (WWW) to view and interact with these pages remotely.

This Amendment is responsive to an interview conducted between Applicants' representative, Victor A. Grossman, and the Examiner on September 19, 2006, in which the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 8 was discussed. The courtesy extended by the Examiner in conducting the interview is greatly appreciated. As agreed, Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to further distinguish these Claims and to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and §102(e). Moreover, it is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner stated that he would provide a courtesy call to Applicants' Attorney before issuing a new Office Action, should one be necessary.

Accordingly, amended Claim 1 includes the recitation of a memory for storing previous display information of a web page previously visited and scrolled by a user; and a controller for detecting the previous display information of the web page from the memory and displaying the web page utilizing the previous display information when the web page is re-visited, wherein the previous display information of the web page includes a start position of a display area of the revisited web page and the start position corresponds with a start position of a scrolled and last viewed display area of the web page at a time of a previous visit to the web page, which the Examiner stated is neither taught or suggested by Tuli. Amended Claim 8 includes similar recitations to those contained in Claim 1 and is patentably distinct for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1 and 8 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-7, and 9-18, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-7, and 9-18 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-18, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP

333 Earle Ovington Blvd. Uniondale, New York 11553

Tel:

(516) 228-8484

Fax:

(516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG:ml